## Case 1:11-cv-05681-PKC Document 12

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
X PIFDAD GARZON	

USDS SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC & \_\_\_\_\_
DATE FILED: //-/0 -//

Plaintiff,

11 Civ. 5681 (PKC) (AJP)

-against-

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

JOFAZ TRANSPORTATION, INC.,
Defendant.

P. KEVIN CASTEL, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Andrew J. Peck, to whom this case was referred for general pretrial supervision, issued a Report and Recommendation (the "R&R") dated September 20, 2011, which recommended transferring this case to the Eastern District of New York. (Docket # 10.) The R&R advised that parties had fourteen days from service to file any written objections. (R&R at 2.) More than fifty days have passed since the R&R was filed, and the plaintiff has submitted no objections.

As noted by the R&R, the Complaint asserts that plaintiff resides in Rego Park,

Queens and worked for defendant Jofaz Transportation, Inc., located at 1 Coffey Street in Brooklyn.

(Compl. at 2; R&R at 1.) The R&R accurately noted that Queens and Brooklyn both are in the

Eastern District of New York. (R&R at 1.) In stating why the action should not be transferred to the

Eastern District of New York, plaintiff stated that "[a]fter two years I am not satisfied with the

proceed of them and they gave me the right change to elect one of four federal districts." (R&R at

1.) Magistrate Judge Peck reasonably inferred that this statement likely reflects plaintiff's

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> I note that the R&R contained the docket number 11 Civ. 5781, as opposed to 11 Civ. 5681. The R&R was, however, docketed under the correct number on September 20, and the docket reflects that the R&R was mailed to the plaintiff. (Docket # 10.) The R & R expressly called plaintiff's attention to Rule 72(b), Fed. R. Civ. P., and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Plaintiff received clear notice of the consequences of the failure to object and has waived the right to object to the R & R or obtain appellate review. See Frank v. Johnson, 968 F.2d 298, 300 (2d Cir. 1992); Caidor v. Onondaga County, 517 F.3d 601 (2d Cir. 2008).

2

dissatisfaction with the EEOC or the State Division of Human Rights, and petitioner's understanding of "four federal districts" arose from districts listed on a generic form. (R&R at 1-2.)

I conclude that the R&R is well reasoned and grounded in law. I adopt the R&R in full, and direct that this action be transferred to the Eastern District of New York.

SO ORDERED.

P. Kevin Castel United States District Judge

Dated: New York, New York November 10, 2011